

Appl. No. 10/560,569
Amdt. Dated December 10, 2007
Reply to Final Office Action of August 9, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 81880.0134
Customer No. 26021

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 4 and 9 are amended. Claims 4-9 and 13 are pending in the application. Support for the amendment to claim 4 can be found at p. 21, line 21 through p. 23, line 3 and Fig. 3 of the specification. Support for the amendment to claim 9 can be found at p. 32, lines 5-14 of the specification. Claims 1-3, 11, and 14 are canceled without prejudice. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-3 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chisako (J.P. Patent Pub. No. 10-332988) in view of Uenoyama, et al. (JP. Pub. 203-139994). Claims 1-3 and 14 have been canceled without prejudice, thus the rejection against those claims is now moot.

Claims 4-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chisako. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 4, has been amended as follows:

An optical receptacle comprising:

a fiber stub;

a holder directly fixing the fiber stub; and

a sleeve into which the fiber stub is inserted, having a thicker portion directly holding the fiber stub;

wherein the thicker portion has an outer surface of the thicker portion not connecting with the holder.

Applicant respectfully submits that Chisako fails to disclose or teach the following features as required by claim 4: (A) a sleeve that has a thicker portion

Appl. No. 10/560,569
Amdt. Dated December 10, 2007
Reply to Final Office Action of August 9, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 81880.0134
Customer No. 26021

((4a) of figure 3) and (B) an outer surface of the thicker portion ((4a) of figure 3) that does not connect with the holder ((5) of figure 3). In contrast, Chisako discloses an optical receptacle comprising an elastic sleeve (15), a grip ring (13) inserted onto an outer periphery of the base end part of the sleeve; and a holder to which the grip ring is attached. The grip ring and sleeve of Chisako are comprised of two pieces and are not integrally formed, like the thicker portion of the sleeve, as required in feature (A) above of claim 4. Therefore, Chisako does not teach or suggest the optical receptacle of claim 4.

The Examiner indicates that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to form in one piece an article that was formerly in two pieces. Applicant respectfully submits that if the sleeve and grip ring disclosed by Chisako could have been formed in one piece, Chisakos' receptacle would still fail to disclose feature (B) indicated above. Since Chisakos' outer surface of the grip ring will be in contact with the holder, then the outer surface of the sleeve will make contact with the holder around a grip ring portion of the integrated member.

Accordingly, Chisako is not obvious over the present claim 4. Likewise, dependent claims 5 -7 are also patentable over Chisako. In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chisako in view of Kato (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0076384). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 8 depends from amended claim 4, and as such includes all the limitations thereof, and is therefore patentable over Chisako for at least the same reasons discussed above with regard to claim 4. Kato is not seen to remedy the

Appl. No. 10/560,569
Amdt. Dated December 10, 2007
Reply to Final Office Action of August 9, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 81880.0134
Customer No. 26021

defects of Chisako and the Office does not rely upon the references for such. Instead, Kato is cited for its relevance regarding chamfering in an optical module.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that, Chisako and Kato could not have anticipated or rendered obvious claim 8, because the cited references fail to teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Withdrawal of this rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 9, 11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0076384). With respect to the canceled claim 11 this rejection is moot. In regards to claims 9 and 13 Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 9, has been amended as follows:

An optical receptacle comprising:

a ceramic precision sleeve for holding a plug ferrule,

wherein a metal holder is provided at a rear end of the precision sleeve, and a metal flange which is electrically insulated from the metal holder is provided on an outer face of the precision sleeve separately from the metal holder.

Applicant respectfully submits that Kato fails to disclose or teach the following features of claim 9: (A) a flange that is provided separately from the precision sleeve and (B) a flange that is made of a material different than the precision sleeve. Instead Kato discloses an optical module including a ceramic or metal guide member (precision sleeve) with a flange integrally formed and a metal holder coupled onto the end of the guide member. More specifically, Kato discloses a precision sleeve with a flange integrally formed of ceramic or metal. Kato fails to disclose a “metal” flange that is provided separately from the metal holder on the outer face of the ceramic precision sleeve and does not disclose that the flange may

Appl. No. 10/560,569
Amdt. Dated December 10, 2007
Reply to Final Office Action of August 9, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 81880.0134
Customer No. 26021

be formed of a material different from the precision sleeve, as required by features (A) and (B) of claim 9.

Accordingly, Kato is not obvious over the present claim 9. Likewise, dependent claim 13 is also patentable over Kato. In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/560,569
Amdt. Dated December 10, 2007
Reply to Final Office Action of August 9, 2007

Attorney Docket No. 81880.0134
Customer No. 26021

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (310) 785-4600 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: December 10, 2007

By 
Dariush G. Adli
Registration No. 51,386
For Hogan & Hartson, LLP

1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, California 90067
Phone: 310-785-4600
Fax: 310-785-4601